



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,279	03/28/2001	Johannes Nicolaas Bakker	NL 000171	6876

24737 7590 10/18/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,279

Applicant(s)

BAKKER ET AL.

Examiner

LUONG T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 11 filed on 8/09/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 filed on 8/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re page 8, Applicants argue that Nobuka fails to teach or suggest averaging stored images.

In response, regarding claim 1, Applicants recited limitation "a light modulation removal means between the processing unit and the end processing unit for removing light modulation between different fields of the picture, by averaging stored images having the same light modulation." The Examiner considers that claim 1 as recited still does not distinguish from combination of Toyoda et al., Nobuoka and Uematsu. Toyoda et al. disclose averaging images as calculating mean brightness in column 3, lines 55-59; column 4, lines 40-47. Toyoda et al. does not show stored images; however, Nobuoka discloses frame memory 8 for storing images (figure 1, column 4, line 58 –column 5, line 10). Therefore, the combination of Toyoda et al. reference and Nobuoka reference shows averaging stored images.

In re pages 7-8, Applicants argue that Toyoda et al. and Nobuoka fail to teach or suggest a light modulation removal means comprising a motion detector for detecting the effect of motion on a scene.

In response, the examiner considers that this Uematsu teaches this feature. Uematsu teaches a flicker reducing circuit 10 consists of a noise reducer 11 in which mosquito noise are removed through motion detection between a previous frame and the following frame, and a motion detection signal in motion detection (figure 1, column 6, lines 49-67).

In re page 9, Applicants argue that Uematsu fails to teach or suggest a camera.

In response, noted that Toyoda et al. teaches this feature. Toyoda et al. teaches a flicker control imaging apparatus, which can be used in a video camera system (column 1, lines 6-14).

In re page 10, Applicants argue that Callahan or Thompson et al. fails to teach or suggest any stored images, a motion detector.

In response, these features are taught in combination of Toyoda et al., Nobuoka and Uematsu, as discussed regarding claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2622

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoda et al. (US 6,630,953) in view of Nobuoka (US 5,926,216) further in view of Uematsu (US 5,892,551).

Regarding claim 1, Toyoda et al discloses a camera for recording pictures comprising an image sensor (imaging 11, figure 2, column 4, lines 18-35) for receiving a picture, a processing unit (pre-processing portion 12, figure 2, column 4, lines 18-35) for processing the picture and an end processing unit (main processing portion 21, figure 2, column 6, lines 9-14), characterized in that the camera comprises a light modulation removal means (combination of elements 14, 15, 17A, 17B, 17C, 17D, 19, 20, figure 2, column 5, lines 1-50, correcting a flicker) between the processing unit and the end processing unit for removing light modulation between different fields of the picture, by averaging images having the same light modulation (calculating mean brightness, column 3, lines 55-59; column 4, lines 40-47).

Toyoda et al. fails to specifically disclose averaging stored images. However Nobuoka teaches an image sensing apparatus, which stores image in frame memory 8 before transmitting images to luminance detector 9 (figure 1, column 4, line 58 – column 5, line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Toyoda et al. by the teaching of Nobuoka in order to temporarily store image before processing.

Toyoda et al. and Nobuoka fail to specifically disclose wherein said light modulation removal means further comprises a motion detector for detecting the effect of motion on a scene. However, Uematsu teaches a flicker reducing circuit 10 consists of a noise reducer 11 in which mosquito noise are removed through motion detection between a previous frame and the

Art Unit: 2622

following frame, and a motion detection signal in motion detection (figure 1, column 6, lines 49-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Toyoda et al. and Nobuoka by the teaching of Uematsu in order to reduce flicker to minimize a degradation of an image (column 4, lines 1-3).

Claim 11 is a method claim of apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the reason given in claim 1.

4. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoda et al. (US 6,630,953) in view of Nobuoka (US 5,926,216) and Uematsu (US 5,892,551) further in view of Callahan (US 6,380,985).

Regarding claim 2, Toyoda et al., Nobuoka and Uematsu fail to specifically disclose the light modulation removal means comprise adaptive fading means for fading between one field and at least n fields, whereby n is the repetition pattern of light modulation. However, Callahan discloses a system for resizing and anti-flicker filter in reduced-size video images, in which after one field is output and begins to fade, the other field is output to replace the fading first field. This alternating pattern results in a continual refreshing of the displayed image (column 4, lines 33-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Toyoda et al., Nobuoka and Uematsu by the teaching of Callahan in order to let the image appears constant the viewer (column 4, lines 39-41).

Regarding claim 3, Toyoda et al. discloses means to calculate the lowest common multiple of the repetition period of said illumination variation and the repetition period of said picture, which lowest common multiple is used as common period to average consecutive images of said picture during recording (column 1, lines 15-26, column 6, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 4, Callahan discloses means to decrease the averaging of consecutive images (Callahan discloses a system for resizing and anti-flicker filter in reduced-size video images, in which after one field is output and begins to fade, the other field is output to replace the fading first field (column 4, lines 33-45). This means the averaging of consecutive images is decreased).

Regarding claim 5, Toyoda et al. discloses means to estimate the modulation strength on a locality of the image (the mean luminance detector 14 calculates mean brightness (modulation strength) of the respective four divided areas of every field, figure 2, column 4, lines 36-47). Callahan discloses reducing means to reduce the averaging on localities where the light modulation is weak (Callahan discloses after one field is output and begins to fade, the other field is output to replace the fading first field, this means that the averaging on localities is reduced, column 4, lines 33-45).

Regarding claim 6, Callahan discloses means to reduce the averaging on localities where the luminance component of said picture is low (Callahan discloses after one field is output and

Art Unit: 2622

begins to fade, the other field is output to replace the fading first field, this means that the averaging on localities is reduced, column 4, lines 33-45).

Regarding claim 7, Callahan discloses means to exclude high spatial frequency components of the picture from the averaging step (Callahan discloses that at a high frequency the flicker is imperceptible to the human eye, the image appears constant to the viewer, column 4, lines 33-45).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoda et al. (US 6,630,953) in view of Nobuoka (US 5,926,216) and Uematsu (US 5,892,551) and Callahan (US 6,380,985) further in view of Thompson et al. (US 6,489,998).

Regarding claim 8, Toyoda et al., Nobuoka, Uematsu and Callahan fail to specifically disclose means to correct consecutive images to the same temporal position using motion compensated conversion techniques prior to the averaging. However, Thompson et al. discloses an apparatus for deinterlacing digital video images comprises a deinterlacing processor which generates the interlaced video stream having reduced motion artifacts (correct consecutive images, column 3, lines 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Toyoda et al., Nobuoka, Uematsu and Callahan by the teaching of Thompson et al. in order to allow for the detection and reduction of motion artifacts in video images, the video image becomes much clearer and appears to be free of defects, column 3, lines 38-42).

Art Unit: 2622

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoda et al. (US 6,630,953) in view of Nobuoka (US 5,926,216) and Uematsu (US 5,892,551) further in view of Thompson et al. (US 6,489,998).

Regarding claim 9, Toyoda et al., Nobuoka and Uematsu fail to specifically disclose de-interlacing means to generated information for any missing position in the original interlaced image, using two images with different interlace phases and equal light modulation phases. However, Thompson et al. discloses an apparatus for deinterlacing digital video images comprises a deinterlacing processor which generates the interlaced video stream having reduced motion artifacts (correct consecutive images, column 3, lines 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Toyoda et al. and Uematsu by the teaching of Thompson et al. in order to allow for the detection and reduction of motion artifacts in video images, the video image becomes much clearer and appears to be free of defects, column 3, lines 38-42).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2622


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID L. OMETZ can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN LN
10/12/06


DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER